

***Village of Barrington  
Architectural Review Commission  
Minutes Summary***

Date: December 15, 2005

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson  
Joe Coath, Vice Chairperson  
Karen Plummer, Commissioner  
Marty O'Donnell, Commissioner  
Mimi Troy, Commissioner

Staff Members: Jim Wallace, Director of Building and Planning; Paul Evans, Assistant Director Planning; Brooke Zurek, Planner; Shannon Conroy, Recording Secretary.

***Call to Order***

Mr. Julian called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

Roll call noted the following: John Julian III, Chairperson, present; Joe Coath, Vice Chair, present; Karen Plummer, present; Marty O'Donnell, present; Mimi Troy, present; Lisa McCauley, absent; Stephen Peterson, absent.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

***Chairperson's Remarks***

Mr. Julian announced the order of proceedings.

***New Business***

**ARC 05-28** J2K2, 303 South Hough Street  
**Petitioner:** Karl Heitman, Heitman Architects, Inc.

Mr. Julian noted that this is a preliminary meeting for renovations to the house and garage at 303 S. Hough St.

Karl Heitman introduced himself for the record and gave an overview of the petition and plans for the renovation. The plans are as follows:

1. Remodel and restore the house close to its original condition and use as a residential/office mix.
2. Open the enclosed front porch.
3. Open the enclosed porch on the north side of the home and use as a main entrance.
4. Replace some second story casement windows with double hung windows.
5. Remove and replace the garage and add surface parking.
6. Use first floor as an office space and second floor as residential.
7. Use basement as storage for the home and office.
8. Convert the attic to living space.
9. Add signage on the property.

Mr. Julian explained the proceedings to Mr. Heitman. He explained that they will review the preliminary

plans and answer questions and let the petitioner know if they are heading in the right direction with the proposed renovation.

Mr. Julian said though it is not a hearing if anyone from the public wished to speak they could do so at this time. There were no public comments.

Mr. Julian asked Mr. Wallace if he wanted to make any comments at this time.

Mr. Wallace gave an overview of standards under which to consider the petition. He stated the proposal is split into two parts:

1. House and grounds including the sign addition.
2. Garage demolition and replacement.

Mr. Wallace suggested discussing the windows, sign, siding and garage in detail so that staff and the commission know what the specific plans are in regard to their replacement and restoration and the petitioner knows what the ARC feels would be permitted.

Mr. Julian asked Mr. Heitman what his impression is in respect to the garage in particular and why he feels in needs to be demolished.

Mr. Heitman noted that there are several areas in which the garage is in severe disrepair. He stated that it is structurally unsound, the base plates are rotted, the ridge is splitting apart, and that the lean-to is basically holding up part of the structure.

Mr. Julian asked what he would have to replace if he was just going to repair it instead of demolishing it.

Mr. Heitman responded that he would have to replace the roof rafters, the ridge beam which has sagged in the middle, most of the structural framing, and much of the siding. He added that the structure is literally propped up with a four-by-four in the center right now.

Mr. Julian asked what the condition of the doors is.

Mr. Heitman replied that they are deteriorated and inoperable. He added they do have nice hardware that could be reused. The windows on them are missing and the glass is broken.

Mr. Coath asked about the lean-to.

Mr. Heitman explained that it appears to have been used as a work area or shop.

Ms. Troy asked if the garage is on a slab and the condition of the slab.

Mr. Heitman said it is on a slab and that it has a lot of uneven settlement and cracks.

Mr. O'Donnell said he has seen the garage and it appears to be in bad shape. He stated that someone should investigate the condition of it further. He also suggested Mr. Heitman have his architects take a look to see if the garage is salvageable.

Mr. Heitman stated they have evaluated the garage and feel that the proposal they are submitting is the best option. They are trying to replicate the facade and restore that to the property.

Mr. O'Donnell encouraged Mr. Heitman to document the details of the garage, and not to just say "it's in bad shape."

Mr. Julian stated that if he were to vote to demolish the garage that he would like to see it exactly as it is now. He would like as close of a match to the original except for the dimensions. He added that the doors really define the garage.

Ms. Plummer asked about the zoning of the property.

Mr. Wallace stated it is zoned for residential with home business occupation.

Joann Lee of Heitman Architects addressed the commission regarding the dimensions of the existing and proposed garage.

Ms. Lee stated that the existing is 16 feet x 32 feet. They are proposing to build a new one measuring 23 feet x 32 feet.

Mr. Julian asked the commission if they all thought the garage is a contributing structure. All agreed that it is contributing.

Ms. Lee stated that it is a one-car garage and they tried to just add on.

Ms. Troy asked Mr. Wallace if there are requirements as to how much surface parking is allowed.

Mr. Wallace replied that there are not.

Mr. Julian stated his concerns about moving the garage off of the street. He said that it loses a sense of the streetscape by moving it off of the sidewalk.

Ms. Plummer stated that the house is an anchor for a residential neighborhood and the parking area will make it more commercial looking.

Mr. Julian agreed and added that it is an encroachment of business into a residential area.

Ms. Troy suggested that it would be helpful to show the adjacent property on their site plan. She added that the garage might be ok to set back since it will be a larger scale building than it is now.

Ms. Plummer stated she thinks it looks more commercial with the parking spaces.

Mr. O'Donnell said that it seems like an ideal use of the property. He added it is a good transition since it is surrounded by commercial property. The focus is really whether they will approve the garage, and then everything else should fall into place.

Mr. Julian stated that he disagrees with Mr. O'Donnell. He said that this is a residential area and if approved that more residences will follow with a commercial look. He added that what it will be used for doesn't concern him.

Ms. Troy asked if the commission has a say in a large tree that is on the property.

Mr. Wallace replied that the owners can remove the tree if they want to.

Mr. O'Donnell discussed the reuse of the garage doors.

Mr. Heitman stated that they can try to reuse them as fixed panels. He also added that they plan to try to replicate the siding and fascia on the new garage.

Mr. Wallace asked the commission when they plan to inspect the garage. Inspection would allow the petitioner to know before the public hearing whether or not demolition will be approved.

Mr. Julian stated that Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Coath will set a date to inspect it.

Mr. Wallace said that staff would also like to be present at the inspection. An appointment at 2pm on Tuesday December 20<sup>th</sup> was set.

Mr. Julian asked if the commission thought the petitioner is headed in the right direction with the proposed reuse of materials.

Ms. Troy answered yes.

Mr. Julian started discussion on the house by asking if the arch windows are original.

Mr. Heitman stated that he couldn't tell for sure if they were original.

Mr. Julian asked about the two enclosed porches they plan to open. One is on the front (west) and one is on the north side.

Mr. Heitman explained that by opening the side porch they would create a new main entrance to the home.

Mr. Coath feels that the front porch has historical significance and is a contributing part of the house.

Mr. Wallace commented that he is in favor of removing the front porch because he believes it conflicts with the original design of the house. Removal would enable house to go back to its true state.

Mr. O'Donnell agreed that how the house was intended is a better house.

Mr. Julian suggested identifying which windows are original to the house. He recommends restoring any that are original.

Mr. Julian addressed the lean-to on the side of the house.

Mr. Heitman explained its former use as an access stairway to the second story of the home. He noted they plan to restore the home so that the second floor can be accessed through the inside of the house via a stairway.

Mr. Julian stated he thought that what some consider mistakes, such as the lean-to, adds character to the historical district.

Mr. Wallace stated that eliminating the lean-to removes a nonconformity of the structure.

Mr. Heitman asked for direction on what type of sign they can use if one is permitted.

Ms. Plummer stated she does not feel a sign that is very commercial is appropriate on this property since it is in a residential neighborhood.

Ms. Plummer commented on the other aspects of the petition. She stated she feels the enclosed porch is historically significant and is against removing the enclosures on the porch. She feels the garage should be demolished since it is in such bad shape, but added the placement of the new one feels more commercial.

Mr. Coath said the wrought iron style of sign is one he prefers because it has more of a pedestrian feel to it and matches some in the area. On the porches he feels the posts are too thick. He would like to see them slenderized somewhat.

Ms. Troy stated she has no problem with removal of the lean-to. She is undecided on the idea of opening up the front porch. Agrees that replacing the casement windows with double hung is a good idea. She likes the proposed new garage and the reuse of the existing panels. She would like to give the signage more thought, but added she likes #3 sign [single pole] from the petition, stating it has more of a residential feel.

Mr. Wallace reviewed the recommendations discussed:

1. Garage: The ARC would like to inspect the garage to see if it is salvageable. It is recommended that the north doors be reused as fixed panels. It should be determined by the ARC whether or not the relocation of the garage is appropriate.
2. Northeast Porch: The consensus is that it is acceptable to open up the porch. Any alterations should reflect Queen Anne form.
3. West Porch Restoration: The consensus is that opening of the west porch is inappropriate.
4. Windows: Newer casement windows can be removed, though the extent of window replacement will depend on the inspection findings.
5. Southeast Shed: Mr. O'Donnell and Ms. Troy agree it is ok to remove the shed. Mr. Julian, Mr. Coath, and Ms. Plummer would like to wait for the inspection to make a determination about the shed.
6. Signage: ZBA should determine if a sign is permitted. If so, the ARC believes the single pole sign is more appropriate.

Mr. O'Donnell asked about the roofing material.

Ms. Lee responded that they will be using asphalt shingles.

Mr. Julian asked what siding material will be used.

Mr. Heitman explained they will save the siding wherever possible and repair where needed. They will match the original siding.

The site visit is scheduled for Tuesday December 20<sup>th</sup> at 2pm with Mr. Wallace, Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Coath.

**ARC 03-08** Bussanmas Residence, 628 South Grove Avenue (Historic) Compliance Review

The petitioner is not present. A notice will be sent to the petitioner informing him that he has 30 days to go to ARC or bring the building into compliance.

**ARC 02-21** Carlstrom Residence, 621 South Grove Avenue (Historic) Compliance Review

The petitioner is not present. A notice will be sent to the petitioner to notify him of his deadline to appear or make due changes to the house.

***Old Business***

**ARC 05-13** Bank of America, 500 N. Hough Street

Mr. Wallace stated that ARC asked Bank of America to submit changes through staff. Upon review of the plans it was noticed that the clock was changed from the original plans. The ring is missing. After discussion it was determined the ring should be included as it makes the clock look less modern.

Details for the cornices were also submitted. The consensus of the ARC was that Mr. Coath would review the plans and give staff his response in a couple of days.

***ARC Meeting Schedule for 2006***

The meeting schedule for 2006 was reviewed.

Ms. Plummer made a motion to approve the meeting schedule for 2006. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion.

Aye: Julian, Coath, Plummer, O'Donnell, Troy. Nay: None. Absent: McCauley, Peterson. Motion carried.

***Dormer Inquiry***

Mr. Wallace discussed an inquiry from Sarah Petersen of S.A. Petersen Architects, Ltd. regarding adding dormers to the Geleske Residence, 536 S. Grove Avenue. Ms. Petersen would like to know if this request can be handled administratively or if she would have to come before the ARC for approval.

The consensus is that this is not something that can be done administratively, and that it would require a public hearing.

Ms. Plummer noted that it applies even more so due to the architect's relationship with Commissioner Stephen Petersen.

***Historic Survey***

Mr. Wallace stated the deadline for the 5 follow up addresses is today, 12/15/05. PZED said that they will go with whatever 5 addresses ARC recommends.

Mr. Julian asked if the deadline can be extended until 12/31/05

Mr. Wallace requested that they are submitted to him via email as soon as possible. He added that references for further readings are also needed. The publishing and budget deadline is Monday December 19<sup>th</sup>.

***Adjournment***

Ms. Plummer moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion. Voice note recorded all ayes. The motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm

Respectfully submitted,  
Shannon Conroy  
Recording Secretary

---

John Julian III, Chairperson  
Architectural Review Commission